

E 713
.081
Copy 1

Democracy and Imperialism

ADDRESS

by the

Hon. Thomas Mott Osborne

delivered at the

Tenth Annual Meeting

of

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
BOSTON

November 30, 1908

Press of the Cambridge Chronicle
Cambridge, Mass.

Democracy and Imperialism

ADDRESS

by the

Hon Thomas Mott Osborne

delivered at the

Tenth Annual Meeting

of

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
BOSTON

November 30, 1908

Press of the Cambridge Chronicle
Cambridge, Mass.

E 713
. O 81

Gift
Published
1909

54

Democracy and Imperialism

On November 14th there appeared the following letter in the Springfield Republican:

To the Editor of the Republican:—

With the crushing defeat of Bryan at the late election, did it not incorporate, also, an equal defeat to anti-imperialism? Surely there is nothing in evidence exhibiting a shadow of strength in the opposition of anti-imperialists to Taft. Their feeble influence heretofore seems to have ebbed toward that oblivion "whence no traveler ever returned." It is well their mission has ended, and their un-Americanism has become nothingness. Many schemes of disturbance have appeared and disappeared at many periods in the past—anti-imperialism has had its black blot in the history of our country, and lies dead in the graveyard of dead isms and issues—dead, without leaving a mark of influence.

L. B. Merriam.

Springfield, November 13, 1908.

The logic of this interesting epistle is no less curious than its literary composition. It is, of course, open to anyone to draw whatever conclusions he likes from the late election; and it has long been a favorite game with politicians to read into election returns anything whatever that seems to favor their own particular interests; but it would puzzle the average person to discover any particular defeat of anti-imperialism that has occurred this year. So far as the ordinary observer can see, no issue of the kind was made in the presidential campaign;—and perhaps some of us think that Mr. Bryan made a serious mistake thereby, and that he would have been far stronger before the country if he had not to all appearances lost interest in the subject upon which he once made a very great speech—perhaps the finest he ever delivered,—that at

Indianapolis in 1900. But whether or not this last thing be true, it is certainly transparently obvious that not in this last campaign, nor ever in any campaign, have the people of the United States been able fairly to express their judgment on the subject of imperialism. In 1900, while it was made a matter of debate, this question was so complicated with the free silver issue, and that of Mr. Bryan's personality, that there could be no genuine expression of judgment upon it. In 1904 the subject was ignored; as it was again in 1908. How anti-imperialism can be defeated, when it has never been an issue, we must leave Mr. Merriam to explain.

The truth is, of course, that it is impossible to defeat a moral issue. Through stupidity or self-interest we may for a time fail to grasp the ethical principles involved; through the faithlessness or indifference of its temporary guardians the affirmative side may suffer eclipse for the moment, or may even be defeated in one form only to reappear in another; but if the issue be a genuine moral one—if the affirmative side be founded on the everlasting foundations of righteousness, you can no more kill it than you can kill the mathematical truth that two and two make four.

Consider how many times in our history the anti-slavery issue was declared killed. Time and time again, as compromise after compromise was brought about,—as one victory of the slavery interest and its northern allies succeeded another, that great moral issue was buried with considerable pomp and circumstance, and its funeral oration preached in market-place and senate amid great public rejoicings. Yet, even before these proceedings were well under way, there again arose the issue, still alive and troublesome, clamoring indeed for death (for such issues do not willingly live—it is only the folly of man that prolongs their lives), but seeking the only dissolution possible—that brought about by boldly facing the truth and doing the right.

Anti-Imperialism, therefore, is still with us, we cannot get rid of it; it will remain with us—cannot indeed be separated from us—until those in whose power it lies shall deliver us from the body of this death.

The more one reflects upon the true character and mission of the United States of America, the more clear the folly and perversity of our imperialist experiment becomes; and the more wretchedly superficial seems the reasoning by which it is defended. Let us consider the question; taking the Philippines for our text.

The main facts are simple enough: In the course of the contest with Spain, growing out of her colonial troubles in Cuba, our ships of war destroyed the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila, thus bringing to an end the tottering Spanish power in the Philippines, and proving for the hundredth time that in war outlying colonies are a source of great weakness.

The Filipinos, like the Cubans, had long been restless and discontented under Spanish misrule. Something in the nature of a native government (just how much is disputed) had grown up as Spain's hold on the Islands had relaxed. When the time came to make a treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, instead of recognizing the rights of the Filipinos to be free, as we did in the case of the inhabitants of Cuba, we bought the Islands of Spain for \$20,000,000, thus paying, as was estimated at the time, about fifty cents apiece for the inhabitants. We assumed possession of the Islands and have held them ever since by force of arms.

But the treaty under which the United States assumed ownership of the Philippines was not confirmed without opposition; it was bitterly opposed by representatives of both parties; and only by the exertion of all the pressure of the government did the treaty pass the senate by just the required number of votes. A shift of one vote would have prevented our embarking on this venture of imperialism; and since that time, as has been stated, the country has never had a fair chance to pass its verdict upon the policy which was then forced upon it.

We Anti-Imperialists make the broad assertion that this country, being as it is a democracy, has no business to own subject colonies. What are the arguments which we meet?

First: That the battle of Manila created a situation from which we could not afterwards escape. That we do not want the Islands, but cannot let them go.

Never mind whether the details used to bolster up this argument be correct or not; whether or not the Filipinos fired first on our soldiers on some important occasion; whether Aguinaldo was a patriot or a mere disturber; is it broadly true that there ever was or could be a situation in which we were powerless to set the Islands free? The question is almost too silly to be answered with a straight face.

Suppose you live on a lonely farm in the suburbs, and a gang of toughs come and take possession of it; feast on your provisions, and make free with your hard-earned property; and suppose some day a squad of policemen makes its appearance and drives away the ruffians; what would your feelings be if

the policemen should in turn proceed to settle themselves as possessors of the property, alleging that they couldn't go away because a situation had been created that made it necessary for them to continue in possession?

In the midst of our Revolutionary struggle with Great Britain, France came to our assistance. Suppose after the Battle of Yorktown, DeGrasse, Rochambeau and Lafayette had landed enough men to cow our ancestors into submission; and then, thrusting Washington aside, had coolly assumed sovereignty, alleging that a situation had been created that made it necessary to continue in possession. As a matter of fact, did France find any difficulty whatever in handling the situation in 1781, according to the dictates of decency and honor? Why should we have found it so difficult in 1898?

Had we so desired, there was absolutely nothing to prevent our leaving the Islands to themselves—to the people to whom they belonged. There is no inherent difficulty today. The difficulties which have been used as a reason are those which we ourselves created; and nothing is easier than to create an obstacle as an excuse for following our own inclination. Let us be frank: We are keeping the Islands not because we cannot come away, but because we either do not want to come away, or think, for some reason, we ought not to do so. The former would arise from motives of self-interest; the latter from a sense of obligation to the Filipinos.

This brings us to the second argument: We must continue our Philippines adventure for the sake of what we can get out of it.

There was a time when it was recognized that mere acreage made the greatness of a nation: That to be big was to be strong and mighty. Japan's victory over Russia ought to dispel that time-worn fallacy for at least the present generation, and it would not today be complimentary to a man's reasoning power to charge him with holding such an opinion; but the mass of the people never surrenders preconceived opinions merely because they involve bad logic. Such fallacies die slowly; and there is such an appeal to the imagination in vast stretches of the same color upon the map of the world, that the idea fastens itself upon us every time we endeavor to shake it off. But surely we have got beyond the necessity of treating such an idea as a serious argument with intelligent people. In extent, the Philippines add nothing to our dignity as a nation: in case of war they would be a weakness as they were to Spain; they have no common ground with us of race, language, religious or political ideals. As an addition to our

territory they are a pure incumbrance.

But there are those who would keep the Islands because of their wealth; because it would be an advantage to us to "develop" them. Reduced to its simplest terms, this is the argument of the slave-driver who worked his "niger" for the benefit of his own pocket. International morality does not exist for such people. Deaf to the teachings of history, they think only of the possibility of personal pecuniary advantage. The one and only bit of ethical advice which they understand or esteem is that of Iago: "Put money in thy purse!"

Yet nothing is more certain than the ultimate failure of all schemes to work colonies for the financial benefit of the mother-country; or dependencies for the advantage of the master-nation. Individuals may grow fat with plunder, but, as a whole, neither country nor colony thrives.

England has, first and last, lavished large sums upon India—not counting the valuable lives she has sacrificed; it has been manifestly a losing game for her. Nor has the burden of imperialism fallen alone upon England, for there seems to be little if any doubt that in India itself the average wealth of the inhabitants has seriously decreased since careful statistics began to be taken; and that the people are steadily getting poorer and poorer.

Where selfishness rules, the situation is far worse; the greater the amount of wealth to be exploited and the easier it is to be gained, the worse for both countries. Look at the commanding position of Spain in the sixteenth century and her rapid decadence. Students of history agree that the chief cause thereof was the riches poured into her lap from the New World. If the love of money is the root of all evil, it is unearned wealth that is the Devil's favorite and most dangerous play-thing. If we are to keep the Philippines, it is greatly to be hoped that the riches of the Islands remain hard for us to get, and small in amount: and if it continues to be a serious losing venture in a commercial sense—so much the better! We may the sooner behold the light!

To keep the Islands for the mere sake of increasing our territory is silly; to keep them for the purpose of robbing them of their wealth is wicked. There remains, however, one other consideration along this line; for there is wealth in the Philippines which may be secured without robbery,—the wealth that comes from honest, legitimate trade.

If there were time, this point would be worthy of development at length; but I must simply point out that the wealth of commerce—the honest wealth that comes to both sides through

the natural exchange of commodities—can be just as well, and indeed far better, carried on between friends as between master and subject. When Massachusetts was an unwilling dependency of England, she refused to trade with the mother-country; when the United States was at war with England in 1814, Massachusetts almost severed the union rather than give up her trade with the old enemy. You cannot gain or secure the blessings of trade by issuing orders to dependencies, or even by treaties; for trade is done between individuals for the benefit of themselves as individuals; and you cannot force individuals to trade where they do not wish to. Trade requires a state of mind, and it will be far better between the United States and the Philippines if the latter are set free, than if they are unwillingly held; especially if our absurd tariff wall were broken down so as to allow of natural and free interchange of commodities. At present we hold fast the Islands and erect a barrier to obstruct trade; could anything be more hopelessly futile and ridiculous as a business proposition?

Next we come to the arguments based upon nobler grounds—the welfare of the Filipinos; and the point is urged that we must maintain our rule over the Islands because the inhabitants are unable to uphold a government of their own. If we should withdraw, anarchy would ensue.

The first answer to this argument is that we have no right to assume anything of the kind; the second is that even anarchy is to be preferred to tyranny. I confess my own conception of the principles of democracy is such that, if the people of any land prefer anarchy to any form of established government, I say, by all means let them have it; perhaps it is a stage in their evolution which is necessary—just as children have to pass through a period of teething—whether or no.

Moreover, let us not forget that what may appear anarchy to people across the ocean may not seem the thing at all at close quarters. During our Civil War, Europe saw the great American Republic involved in hopeless anarchy and confusion—apparently going down in ruins; and it was seriously proposed to interfere and stop such unseemly breach of the world's peace. Yet we know now, and the wisest knew at the time, that that great conflict was necessary to preserve the Union; that it was not anarchy that was going on, but the relaying of the foundations of democracy.

So the anarchy argument fails, whether looked at from the historical or the ethical point of view. As an historical fact, what we mean by anarchy in such a case—serious social confusion—has been again and again the outward evidence of deep-

seated movements, which result in the formulation of some system of government best fitted for the time and circumstances. Never yet in the world's history has one nation been ultimately successful in forcing upon another its own civilization and ideals in order to prevent anarchy. We can warp, distort or destroy a tree, or we can assist in creating favorable conditions for its growth and development, *but we cannot make it grow*. The principle of life is in the tree—and in the free elements about it—in the sunshine and the air; we can only assist the processes of nature, we cannot substitute our own.

The Philippines are entitled to their own form of development,—be it apparent anarchy or manifest progress; Japan has shown what freedom from outside interference can do when a nation has within itself the germ of spontaneous and rapid growth. Perhaps the Filipino has the same God-like faculty. Let us beware how we assume that he has it not; and warp, distort or destroy the purposes of God.

Next we are told that we must hold the Islands to prevent their being seized upon by some other power—Great Britain, Germany or Japan.

This argument is no less flimsy than the last. One might begin by hazarding the suggestion that if it is a question of the Filipinos being held in subjection by some one, perhaps the inhabitants might prefer to choose their own guardian; possibly they would gain by the rule of Japan or Great Britain rather than "benevolent assimilation" by the United States. Why should we assume that our own particular rule is so necessary to the Philippines? Has it not borne bitter fruit already? Has it escaped violence and blood-shed? Does it satisfy the people of the Islands? Have we been so successful in perfecting the details of our own form of government that we are justified in deciding upon those for other people? And if these questions are all answered satisfactorily, there still remains the fact that nothing could be simpler than to take the Philippines under our protection and say to every nation in the world: "Hands off!" It would be as easy to protect the Islands in the character of a generous and unselfish friend as in that of an imperious overlord, and perhaps easier. Our attitude toward Cuba convicts us of ridiculous inconsistency out of hand.*

*The "neutralization" of the Philippines is, of course, to be preferred to any protectorate; a guarantee by all the powers that the Islands will be let alone;—allowed to develop naturally, as Japan has developed.

Next comes the argument that it is our duty to civilize and educate the inhabitants of the Islands, with or without the implied admission that they are to be set free some time or other.

If true civilization, if the true education of a people consists in material things, in good roads, fine bridges, uniformed police, all those wonderful evidences of administrative efficiency, such as are to be seen in India, for example, then I grant that it can probably be produced in the Philippines under our rule much quicker than by home rule. A veneer of civilization under imperialism is comparatively easy to produce,—and there are no sights more impressive or superficially alluring than the relics of Roman imperialism of old, or of British imperialism of today; but was not that the very kind of civilization which our ancestors spurned, when they threw away the comforts and refinements of English sovereignty? Education of a sort can be forced wherever you have the power—there are no places in the world so offensively and tragically clean as your prisons; but is that a kind of education we demand for our own children? or would accept even at the point of the bayonet?

What business have we to go to the other side of the globe, to a land where, by accident, we have the power, and say: "These are our ideas of what is good for you; and we propose to civilize and educate you according to these ideas? It makes no difference what you want or don't want, what you like or dislike, we propose to decide for you. You must submit; because we are stronger than you and can beat you, and if necessary, will beat you into submission."

England has been trying this sort of thing in India for over a hundred years; and doing it much better (for reasons to be mentioned later) than we can ever hope to do it. Is it a success? Certainly wonderful administrative efficiency has been shown there; as a great London paper has recently said, and said truly:

"We have made life and property secure; we have administered justice to all men; we have spread the benefits of education far and wide; we have allowed freedom of speech and freedom of the press; we have respected religion and religious prejudice with care; we have upheld a standard of scrupulous purity and honesty in public affairs; we have thrown open to the utmost possible extent the service of India to the Indians; we have run the road and bridged the river; above all, perhaps, we have made men of millions of down-trodden

serfs; we have been the immediate cause that the native of India has come to respect himself."

All this have Englishmen done for India, and what is the result? Are they beloved by the people of India? Is the English rule accepted with gratitude for all its splendid unselfish work—for all the human lives and treasure expended upon it? Read your newspapers. India is seething with discontent; the Viceroy has recently had to abandon his trip of inspection and has returned under a heavy guard to Calcutta; in the different provinces bombs are being hurled at the chief officials, and murders are becoming alarmingly frequent; native newspapers are being suspended and suppressed. On all sides it is agreed that never since the Great Mutiny has the situation been so serious. Yet—irony of fate!—the Secretary of State for India, in the British Cabinet, is *John Morley*!

Listen again to the Simla correspondent of the Daily Telegraph:

"How comes it, many will say, that with an administration framed upon such excellent lines, there is the opportunity for even malevolent criticism to obtain such publicity in the peninsula. To this there is one sufficient answer. No government has ever saved itself merely by its own virtue and probity. Alexander the Just met the same fate as Heliogabulus, his predecessor, and Maximin, his successor; and the very liberality with which we have permitted the free publication and discussion of political heresies has encouraged a thousand to preach disobedience where, under the sterner code of Rome, even one might have hesitated to betray his secret aspirations. The truest commentary upon our policy in India was written a hundred years ago by the only European to whom it has ever been given to understand the inmost soul of the native of India. What is, and must remain for us, a sealed book, so far as many of its chapters are concerned, was read by the Abbe Dubois from cover to cover, and his final estimate of the necessary relations between the English and the Indian is as true today as when it was written. Of that estimate the kernel is contained in the following sentence: 'Under the supremacy of the Brahmins the people of India hated their government, while they cherished and respected their rulers; under the supremacy of Europeans they hate and despise their rulers from the bottom of their hearts, while they cherish and respect their government.' * * * * * I venture to predict that the British will attempt in vain to effect any very considerable changes in the social condition of the people of India. To make a people happy it is essential that they themselves should desire to be

made happy, and should co-operate with those who are working for their happiness. Now the people of India, as it appears to me, neither possess this desire nor are anxious to co-operate to this end. Every reform which is obviously devised for their well-being they obstinately push aside, if it is likely in the least degree to disturb their manner of living, their most absurd prejudice, or their most puerile custom.'

"If this is as true today as it was a hundred years ago—and it unquestionably is—we need not look far for the causes of any unrest that may exist today. If the inability of the Hindoo to appreciate either the personality or the labors of those who, well or ill, administer India is as pronounced as ever, we who, to the best of our ability, have instilled in him the principles of patriotism, citizenship, and co-operation, and have, moreover, made him articulate, need take small blame to ourselves if our work still meets with little appreciation among those for whose sole benefit it is designed."

Oh! the blindness of men! Can you not see, you English, the key to this wonderful secret—the explanation of this great mystery—of this "inability of the Hindoo to appreciate" all your wonderful and unselfish devotion. Search your own hearts; and if you find not the answer there, turn to the pages of John Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, and there read those golden words of the great statesman who labored to give justice to Ireland: "*It is Liberty alone that fits men for Liberty.*"

"What profiteth it a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" You have given to the people of India all the material benefits—security of life and property, justice and education, freedom of speech and religion, honest administration, roads and bridges;—you have given him everything that can be asked of a government, have you not? All? Yes, everything;—*except one thing*, except that which is worth a thousand times more than all these put together, that without which all these are as nothing, the one vital thing that makes the difference between the slave and the man—FREEDOM.

Can we do more for the Philippines than Great Britain has done for India? No;—and yes. We cannot hope to excel her in excellent administration; for we are a democracy, while England is an imperial aristocracy, but at the end of a term of years we may perhaps bring about something approaching the efficiency and excellence of the Indian government, and with the same mournful result—a discontented population on the verge of a violent outbreak against its unselfish and well-meaning oppressors.

But we can, if we choose, do more,—much more for the

Philippines than England has done for India; we can make ourselves their loyal and devoted friend; opening our ports to reciprocal trade; offering every help in our power toward high ideals and high accomplishment; and giving that most efficient help possible—the setting of a great example. The way to do this is to withdraw our army and establish independence; and the time to do it is not a century hence, nor a generation hence, not ten years nor five, *but now, straightway, the sooner the better.* Every moment of delay is fraught with injustice to the Philippines and danger to ourselves.

These are all the arguments that I have ever heard for keeping the Philippines; and I have tried to show them as I believe them to be, one and all in their essence weak and futile. But suppose for a moment they were valid, suppose that the Philippines can *not* take care of themselves, and that the Islands would be grabbed by some nation suffering from world-hunger; suppose our departure would result in such disorder that the worst of fates, that of the Kilkenny cats, would befall the Filipinos; suppose we grant that without our help the Islands will never be civilized or educated; suppose that untold wealth is ours if we keep them; suppose any and all of these, what then? It would still be our solemn duty to withdraw; for it still remains true what was said by Bishop Potter, I think, “The real question is not what shall we do with the Philippines, but *what* will the Philippines do with us?” It is the danger to ourselves that is of most importance to us and to the world.

This country is a democracy;—a fact that is not unfamiliar to most of us; but how many there are who fail to appreciate the personal responsibilities that follow from that fact! How many who fail to understand just why we are a democracy; and why, as a democracy, it is impossible for us to play at the same time the part of an empire! We may be one or the other—but we can’t be both. Many people there are who confuse the ideas of a republic and a democracy. Republics there have been before ours—the imperial republic of Rome, the aristocratic republic of Venice, the feudal republic of Switzerland, the paternalistic republic of the Netherlands; but ours is the first great DEMOCRACY, the first nation founded boldly upon the principle that all men are created equal—the political expression of the Golden Rule. For that is what it comes to. Four great systems of government before ours had been tried in the world and had failed to satisfy mankind. After many separate and crude experiments in government, and many failures, Rome brought all the known world under her imperial

sway—in the first great organized system of human society; and then to oppose the imperial idea there arose—*Christianity*. Imperialism rested upon one great basic principle, "*Might makes Right*"; and the human relations at the base of that proposition are necessarily those of master and slave. But at the very moment of its complete triumph, at that dramatic instant when the form of the Roman government itself had been changed to suit the fundamental system, and Augustus Caesar had overthrown the republic and become *Imperator*; at that moment was heard the low, grave voice of the Hebrew Prophet, "*Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you.*"

The death-knell of imperialism was given in that sentence. It became at once the touchstone by which all future forms of government must be tried; and no government has ever been able permanently to endure, because it could not stand that test. First it was the Imperialism of Rome that fell; then it was the Feudalism of Mediaeval Europe; then it was the Paternalism of the Stuarts or the Bourbons; then the Pseudo-Imperialism of Napoleon Bonaparte. As one looks through history, one after the other the carefully built-up systems of tyranny crumble and fall; and upon their ruins, foolish man—failing to see the obvious rock upon which the wrecks have occurred,—refusing to recognize the great truths of the religion he professes, tries again, and yet again, to make some new combination that will stand, and perpetuate the power of privilege. Imperialism, the rule of the strong over the weak—of master over the slave; Feudalism, the rule of overlord over vassals; Paternalism, the rule of a monarch claiming divine authority over subjects; Aristocracy, the rule of a social caste over the mob; now one and now the other; now a combination of these two and now of those; but always the refusal of the great mass of the people to be satisfied long with a system which gives special privileges to the favored few; thus denying the vital principle of the rule of life laid down by Jesus.

This, then, is the meaning of democracy; a system of government based upon equal justice and equal privilege for all men; the political expression of the Golden Rule.

But when this new system of human government was outlined in the great Declaration, and later worked into concrete form in our Federal Constitution, our statesmen did not have clear vision on one vital point. The slavery compromises of the Constitution may have been politically wise as a temporary concession to human weakness; but they were a blot upon a noble instrument and perpetuated in our democracy a relic of

imperialism. And we suffered bitterly for the sin, of lack of faith in our own political ideal.

Lincoln said: "This nation cannot permanently endure half slave and half free." He was right, and upon analysis it is easy to see why he was right. It was because imperialism and democracy are not only different systems of government, but *opposing* systems of government. One is based upon the theory that "Might makes Right,"—the other denies that theory; the one assumes that one man is entitled to rule another man without his consent, the other says that all men are created equal and that governments exist only for the sake of the governed; the one denies the Golden Rule, the other affirms it. How can they exist together. As well may fire and water meet in harmony!

But if this is true of the individual, it is also true of the nation. If our democracy could not exist in combination with one form of imperialism, neither can it exist with the other. You can have an imperial republic, but you cannot have an imperial democracy. If slavery—the rule of one man over another—was a denial of the Golden Rule, a negation of democracy: so is the rule of one nation over another. And as Lincoln truly said that this nation could not endure half slave and half free, so we can truly say that *this Nation cannot endure a democracy at home and an empire abroad.*

I have been told that I cannot form a proper judgment of this Philippine matter because I have not visited the Islands. That we must go to Manila and see the splendid work that our Tafts, our Wrights, and our Forbeses have done, and are doing, before we can properly make up our minds; and that in the meantime we must accept the judgment of those who know from practical observation.

But I have often found that those who are in the thick of things are often the poorest judges; and, moreover, there are some things that we can know perfectly well without seeing. The greatest and most important truths are those of which no ocular proof can be had. We do not need to journey to Manila to understand the Ten Commandments.

It is the same old story. Hosea Biglow says:

"Parson Wilbur he calls all these argimunts lies;

Sez they're nothin' on airth but jest *fee, faw, fum*;

An' thet all this big talk of our destinies

Is half on it ign'rance, an' t'other half rum."

Parson Wilbur was not quite right, unless he included a great many things under the name of "ignorance"; but it is certainly true that the Imperialists must always fall back upon



John P. Robinson's argument, that "They didn't let
thin' down in Judee."

We are trying out, in this country, a new system of government—*Democracy*. We have not been long at it, as the world moves. We have had splendid results, and we have survived at least one deadly peril. We have problems before us worthy for any number of intellects to solve; but we cannot solve them, we cannot succeed, we can never retain our proper place in the world's history unless we keep our democracy pure and unsullied; keep our faith in the splendid results of individual and national freedom; unless we keep on believing that "It is liberty alone that fits men for liberty." And above all we must make our deeds square with our professions. We must yield to others the liberty we claim as our own God-given right.

Brethren of the faith, be not discouraged, our cause is neither dead nor dying; the way may be long, but the end is sure. Imperialism, like slavery, is the negation of democracy, and it will not endure.

We must take our stand boldly upon the teachings of Jesus. If he was right in his enunciation of the Golden Rule then all the apologists of tyranny and bloodshed are plainly and tragically wrong. If they are right—if the denial of *freedom* can be compensated for by good roads, by bridges and harbors and all the luxuries of efficient government—then is the message of Jesus a mistake, the Golden Rule an impracticable doctrine, and the Christian religion, that we profess, a hideous failure.

But we know that is not true. We know that with Him, to whom a thousand years are but as a day, there will and can be no permanent backward turning: That the hearts of men will be opened to the truth at last. Lowell—our truest poet of democracy, has sung:

"Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record
One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the
Word;

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim un-
known,

Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.
We see dimly in the Present what is small and what is great,
Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of fate,
But the soul is still oracular; amid the market's din

List the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within,—
'They enslave their children's children who make compromise
with sin.' "